



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,263	07/11/2007	James Russell	RUSSELL6	9299
1444 7590 11/24/2009 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303				
EXAMINER SHAW, AMANDA MARIE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1634				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/591,263

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL ET AL.

Examiner

Amanda Shaw

Art Unit

1634

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4, 10-14, 16, 18-20, 22-23, 32-34, 36, 44-50, 53, 56, 58, 60-63, 64-69, 73, 75, 79, 83-87 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,2,4,10-14,16,18-20,22,23,32-34,36,44-50,53,56,58,60-69,73,75,79 and 83-87.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 10-14, 16, 18-20, and 22-23, drawn to a method for obtaining a prognosis for a subject having or at risk of developing an inflammatory condition.

Group 2, claim(s) 32-34, drawn to a method for selecting a group of subjects for determining the efficacy of a candidate drug known or suspected of being useful for the treatment of an inflammatory condition.

Group 3, claim(s) 36, 44-50, 53, 56, 58, 60-62, 64-68, drawn to a method of treating an inflammatory condition in a subject in need thereof.

Group 4, claim(s) 69, 73, 75, 79, 83, 85, 86, and 87 drawn to oligonucleotides and compositions comprising oligonucleotides.

Group 5, claim(s) 84, drawn to a computer readable medium

2. The inventions listed as Groups 1-5 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

A 371 case is considered to have unity of invention only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or

corresponding technical features. The expression "special technical feature" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. In the instant application, the linking technical feature of polymorphic sites in the protein C gene does not constitute a contribution over the prior art. For example, Spek (Journal of Biological Chemistry 1995) teaches two mutations in the promoter region of the human protein c gene that cause thrombosis (see abstract). Further Spek teaches oligonucleotides specific for the detecting the polymorphism. (see page 24217). Thus, there is no special technical feature linking the recited groups, as would be necessary to fulfill the requirement for unity of invention.

Election of Species

3a. This invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: the protein C sequence (SEQ ID NO: 1), the EPCR sequence (SEQ ID NO: 2), and both the protein C and EPCR sequences (SEQ ID Nos: 1 and 2).

If Applicant elects either Group 1, 2, or 3 Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (a single gene [and its corresponding sequence] OR a single combination of sequences [and their corresponding sequences]) to which the

claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group: 1, claims 1, 2, 4, 10-14, and 22-23

Group: 2, claims 32-34

Group: 3, claims 36, 44-50, 53, 58, 60-62, 64-68

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In the instant case the different genes encompassed by the claims fail to share a common property or activity because each gene consists of a unique nucleotide sequence, has a distinct melting temperature, and a distinct specificity of hybridization. Further each gene encodes for a protein having a distinct amino acid sequence and a distinct biological activity. Additionally the genes fail to share a common structure with one another. For these reasons the genes cannot be considered as having the same or corresponding technical feature.

3b. This invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: each SNP and each combination of SNPs encompassed by claims.

If Applicant elects either Group 1, 3, or 5 Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (single SNP or a single combination of SNPs) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The election must be commensurate with the election in paragraph 3a above. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group: 1, claims 1, 2, 4, 10-14, 16, 18-19, 20, and 22-23

Group: 3, claims 36, 44-50, 53, 56, 58, 60-62, 64-68

Group: 5, claim 84

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that all of the SNPs share a common property or activity. Further the SNPs do not share the same structure. For these reasons the SNPs cannot be considered as having the same or corresponding technical feature.

3c. This invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: each inflammatory disease encompassed by the claims.

If Applicant elects Group 1 or 3, Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (a single inflammatory disease) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group: 1, claims 1, 2, 4, 10-14, 16, 18-19, 20, and 22.

Group: 3, claims 36, 44-48, 50, 53, 56, 58, 60-62, 64-68

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that each of the diseases shares common property or activity. Further each disease does not share the same structure. For these reasons the diseases cannot be considered as having the same or corresponding technical feature.

3d. This invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: each anti inflammatory agent and anti coagulant agent encompassed by the claims.

If Applicants elects Group 3, Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (a single anti inflammatory agent or anti coagulant agent) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group: 3, claims 36, 44-48, 50, 53, 56, 58, 60-62, 64-66

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that each of the anti inflammatory agents and each of the anti coagulant agents shares common property or activity. Further each of these agents do not share a common structure. For these reasons the agents cannot be considered as having the same or corresponding technical feature.

3e. This invention contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: the oligonucleotide probes recited in claims 69, 73, 75, and 79.

If Applicants elects Group IV Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (a single oligonucleotide probe OR a single combination of oligonucleotide probes) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group: 4, claims 69, 73, 75, 79, 83, 85, 86, and 87

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In the instant case the different probes encompassed by the claims fail to share a common property or activity because each probe consists of a unique nucleotide sequence, has a distinct melting temperature, and a distinct specificity of hybridization. Additionally the probes fail to share a common structure with one another. For these reasons the probes cannot be considered as having the same or corresponding technical feature.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time

of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda M. Shaw whose telephone number is (571)

272-8668. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 TO 4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Nguyen can be reached at 571-272-0731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda M. Shaw
Examiner
Art Unit 1634

/Stephen Kapushoc/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634